



993 Old Eagle School Road, Suite 415  
Wayne, PA 19087-1710

(610) 971-0900  
FAX: (610) 971-9715

HNPH/51-1-4-93

February 7, 1994

Project Number 0159

Mr. Lonnie Monaco  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Northern Division  
Environmental Contracts Branch, Mailstop No. 82  
10 Industrial Highway  
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D1298  
Contact Task Order (CTO) No. 134

Subject: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes of January 13, 1994  
Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC)  
Warminster, Pennsylvania

Dear Mr. Monaco:

Enclosed please find the minutes from the RAB meeting held at NAWC Warminster on January 13, 1994. Copies of the minutes are being sent to the individuals identified on the distribution list.

Please contact me at (610) 971-0900 if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kevin C. Kilmartin".

Kevin C. Kilmartin, CPG  
Assistant Project Manager

KCK/dhd

Enclosure

cc: Tom Ames (NAWC Warminster)  
Mike Hunter (NAWC Warminster)  
Raymond Mannella (NAVFACENGCOM)  
Neil Teamerson (Halliburton NUS)  
John Trepanowski (Halliburton NUS)  
Michael Turco (Halliburton NUS)  
Jeffrey Orient (Halliburton NUS)  
Georgia Masters (NAWC Economic Adjustment Committee)  
RAB Members

**NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER (NAWC) WARMINSTER MEETING MINUTES**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING NO. 20**  
**REFERENCE: CLEAN CTO NO. 134**

=====

1. Meeting Date and Time: January 13, 1994, 9:15 a.m. to 10:50 a.m.
2. Location: NAWC, Warminster, Pennsylvania
3. Attendees: See Attachment 1
4. Summary of Meeting Minutes:

Tom Ames, the NAWC Warminster Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) environmental coordinator (BEC), opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and requested that all attendees introduce themselves. Mr. Ames distributed the agenda for the meeting. A copy of Mr. Ames' handout is included as Attachment II.

Mr. Ames asked if everyone had received the minutes of the last RAB meeting (December 9, 1993) and if there were any comments. Norman Kelly, the RAB co-chairman, noted that in the last full paragraph on page 3 of the minutes, he is reported as questioning the distribution plans for the various base surveys. Mr. Kelly asked that the minutes be clarified to reflect that the Bucks County NAWC Economic Adjustment Committee (EAC) had raised this question and that he was reporting it to the RAB. Another correction to the minutes, noted later in the meeting, is that John Geyer, of the Northampton Township Board of Supervisors, was consistently referred to as Richard Lander, of the Northampton Municipal Authority. The RAB meeting minutes of December 9, 1993 will be amended to incorporate these corrections.

Mr. Ames stated that the draft Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) report required under CERFA had been completed and is currently undergoing regulatory review. Mr. Ames noted that the executive summary of the report had been sent to the RAB members and that the full report was available to them for their review. Mr. Ames stated that two clean parcels of land had been identified in the report. The first is the parcel of land across Bristol Road that is currently leased for agricultural use; the second is a four-acre parcel located west of Jacksonville Road, between the northern fence of the parking lot and the John Wagner & Sons property. Mr. Ames added that other parcels are being studied further and that the BRAC closure team will be working with the EAC concerning land reuse plans.

Jeffrey Orient, the Halliburton NUS Corporation (HNUS) project manager for all field investigation activities, began a presentation to inform the RAB on the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) activities that had occurred since December 9, 1993. A copy of Mr. Orient's handouts is included as Attachment III.

Mr. Ames began an update on the status of the municipal water connections. Tim Pursel, of the Upper Southampton Municipal Authority, stated that all the residents of Upper Southampton Township who had submitted claims to the Navy for their municipal water connections had been reimbursed.

Joseph Butch, of the Warminster Township Municipal Authority (WTMA), stated that the WTMA consulting engineers are proceeding with design plans for water main construction and added that negotiations for the water main construction were continuing between the WTMA and the Corps of Engineers (COE). Mr. Butch expressed concern with the slow rate of progress being made in the negotiations and noted that the WTMA goal of completing the construction by late spring may no longer be feasible. Mr. Butch stated that the construction plans for the water main along Davisville Road (being carried out by WTMA without federal involvement or reimbursement) are currently in progress. Darius Ostrauskas, the EPA remedial project manager, stated that EPA was attempting to facilitate the negotiations between WTMA and COE.

Mr. Hopely, a local citizen, questioned why the WTMA was still at the negotiating stage while the citizens of Upper Southampton Township had already received public water and their reimbursement checks. Mr. Butch replied that it was a matter of scale. The WTMA work to be done is considerably more involved than the work already completed in Upper Southampton Township.

Mr. Ames began an update on the BRAC cleanup plan (BCP). Mr. Ames stated that EA Engineering, under contract to the Navy, is currently assembling the document. Mr. Ames noted that the document's deliverable date to the Navy is the end of February 1994 but, as discussed at the last RAB meeting, there will be partial or incremental submissions of the document that will be sent to the RAB members for review. Mr. Ames added that BCP is due to the Department of Defense (DOD) by the end of April 1994.

Mr. Butch asked about the status of the Operable Unit 1 (OU-1) interim remedial design. Mr. Orient replied that the preliminary design document is due to the Navy the week of January 17, 1994. Neil Teamerson, the HNUS project manager for off-base activities, added that the draft work plan outlining the treatability study for the final remedy is currently under Navy review. Mr. Butch asked if any further testing needed to be done to support the design effort. Mr. Teamerson replied that geotechnical testing to support the interim design was recently completed, and Mr. Orient added that no further testing is planned. Darius Ostrauskas, the EPA remedial project manager, stated that the potential needs for further hydrogeological testing would be discussed at the next technical subgroup meeting. Mr. Ames concluded the discussion of OU-1 by stating that the release point of the treated groundwater to a surface water body has not been finalized.

Mr. Butch asked about the status of Operable Unit 2 (OU-2). Mr. Ostrauskas replied that OU-2 has become the municipal water connection project. Operable Unit 3 (OU-3) will be shallow groundwater contamination associated with Sites 4 and 8. Mr. Ostrauskas continued that the source of contamination is unknown and that no remedy is in place. Mr. Ostrauskas added that the investigation work in this vicinity would occur more or less simultaneously with the investigations planned in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. Butch questioned how or when the deep aquifer studies would be addressed. Mr. Ostrauskas replied that, although the deep groundwater has not yet been designated as an operable unit, the study of this medium has begun. Up to 10 deep wells at Area A are planned as part of the upcoming groundwater investigation. Mr. Butch stated that he did not believe that the deep groundwater could be divided into geographic parcels (as was the shallow groundwater) and that only one operable unit should be designated for this medium. Mr. Orient concurred.

David Fennimore (Earth Data, Incorporated, representing Warminster Township Municipal Authority) stated that the definitions of the operable units seemed to be changing and requested firm definitions. Mr. Teamerson replied that the operable units are used for planning purposes and to focus investigations and that their definitions may change during the course of these investigations. It is the Record of Decision (ROD) that fixes the definition of the OU. Therefore, with the exception of OU-1, firm definitions do not exist for the OUs.

Mr. Ostrauskas stated that the OUs represent decision-making points. As an example, OU-3 (Sites 4 and 8) is projected to be the next decision-making point due to the timing of the investigations. However, if data from the investigations from the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 are available at the same time, then that area could also be incorporated into OU-3. As a further example, Mr. Ostrauskas stated that, in the case of OU-1, the Proposed Plan included all shallow groundwater, but EPA ultimately determined that insufficient information was available to make a "base-wide" decision for shallow groundwater. Specifically, the public had not been given the chance to comment on areas other than Areas A and B because insufficient data existed for the other areas.

Mr. Butch then questioned whether the above discussion meant that only Areas A and B will be addressed by the OU-1 interim remedial remedy. Mr. Ostrauskas replied affirmatively and added that this was the reason that potential shallow groundwater contamination at Sites 4 and 8 and in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 was being pursued so aggressively. David Kennedy, of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, noted the concern of Mr. Butch that the present interim remedy is limited to Areas A and B and stated that the treatment plant is intentionally being built "oversized" in order to accommodate additional volume.

Mr. Ames, in response to Mr. Fennimore, concluded this discussion by stating that the definitions of OU-1 and OU-2 are firm and that he would work on getting their definitions distributed to the RAB members. Mr. Ames began an update on the community reuse issue by noting that KWT radio had quoted Andrew Warren recently as stating that reuse plans are speeding up and would receive considerable attention in 1994. Mr. Ames stated that Georgia Masters, of the EAC, had been invited to this RAB meeting but was unable to attend; he added that Ms. Masters would be available and will be invited to the February 1994 RAB meeting. Mr. Ames noted that the Cooper & Lybrand report being drafted for the EAC should also then be available. Mr. Butch stated that the draft Cooper & Lybrand report is currently being reviewed and may be issued in late January or early February 1994. Mr. Butch added that the study apparently confirms what most people suspected as far as the number of people who will relocate, the advantages of the site, etc. Mr. Butch also stated that the survey done by the Public Relations Committee of the EAC also confirmed what many people suspected concerning the public's desires for land reuse. Specifically, Mr. Butch noted that a college campus or a research center was high on the public's list and that a municipal airport was the least desirable reuse plan. Mr. Butch concluded by stating that he has mentioned to the EAC that they need to get some of this information out to the public.

Eugene McGough, the Warminster Township Manager, stated that he, Mr. Kelly, and Ms. Masters had recently attended a meeting dealing with the McKinney Act. Mr. McGough stated that the act must be acknowledged, considered, and be a part of any reuse plan. Mr. McGough added that the EAC has inquired but not yet received a reply concerning the availability of facilities for the homeless in Bucks County, specifically where such facilities are and where do the people who use them come from.

Mr. Geyer noted that the Pryor Act apparently states that federal facilities to be closed may be reserved for possible military use during future national emergencies. Joe Cody, the Department of Defense Base Transition Coordinator, replied that there are no plans to reclaim NAWC Warminster for such use. Mr. Geyer stated that, according to the Pryor Act, then, a statement to that effect must be made in writing before reuse plans can proceed. Mr. Cody replied that the statement will be made at the proper time and reiterated that, at this time, there are no plans to potentially reclaim the base.

Mr. Cody updated the RAB on several issues that were raised during the last RAB meeting. Mr. Cody noted that the EAC recognizes the need to interact more closely with the RAB and that they plan to do so. Mr. Cody then stated that the Department of Defense is currently writing its own interpretation of the McKinney Act and the Pryor Act (the Pryor Act is a series of inserts that go into the McKinney Act). Mr. Cody noted that one effect of the Pryor Act is to compress the McKinney Act time schedule. Mr. Cody then outlined the following scenario for NAWC Warminster. He noted that the federal screening of the base would soon be concluded and that consideration of the McKinney Act was the next step in the process. A 30-day period will exist for a homeless provider to express an interest in using the facility. If a provider expresses interest, the provider is given 60 additional days to deliver firm plans. If no provider expresses interest in the facility during the 30-day period, or if the provider fails to deliver firm plans within the additional 60 days, then the community has one year to develop reuse plans. If the community is not successful, then the process "recycles" back to McKinney Act considerations. Mr. Cody concluded that a major impact of the Pryor Act is the establishment of the "windows of opportunity" and the time schedules; the McKinney Act had given the providers to the homeless unlimited access to the federal facilities. Mr. Ames noted that the one-year period for NAWC Warminster could start by March 1, 1994. Mr. Cody replied that the key is when the federal screening process will formally close but added that this event is not too far away.

Mr. Cody then addressed the question (raised during the last RAB meeting) of whether it is a foregone conclusion that the land will automatically go to the community. Mr. Cody stated that, at this point, the community is really the only party that has expressed an interest. The U.S. Postal Service, which had made some preliminary inquiries, was given until January 14, 1994 to confirm if it was interested. Mr. Cody added that the land would probably be offered to the community at below-market value but that it would not be given to the community. If the community does not express an interest in the land, then it could be offered on the private market. Mr. Cody concluded that, if the community purchases and then resells the land, it may have to reimburse some amount of money to the government. Mr. McGough asked how the fair market value of land that is on the National Priorities List is established, and Mr. Butch asked if there would be a bidding process for the land. Mr. Cody replied that it is premature at this time to attempt to answer either question. Mr. Teamerson asked if the reuse plan only addresses clean parcels. Mr. Cody replied that the reuse plan addresses the entire facility or all land to be disposed.

Mr. Ames then opened the floor to questions and comments.

David Finch (Upper Southampton Township) questioned whether the treated water from the OU-1 interim remedy would be released into Southampton Creek. Mr. Ames stated that the treated water would be released into a tributary of Little Neshaminy Creek. Mr. Kennedy noted that the release point may be the existing sewage outfall structure for the base. Mr. Teamerson added that, as the treatment system is presently designed, no treated water would flow through Upper Southampton Township. Mr. Finch stated for the record that streams in Upper Southampton Township have chronic flooding problems and that the township would be concerned if the treated water discharged to its streams.

Mr. Teamerson distributed maps illustrating the results of the off-base well sampling program in Casey Village and along Kirk Road. Mr. Fennimore noted that the illustrated compounds were all chlorinated solvents and questioned why the wells along Kirk Road were not sampled for compounds of concern that would typically be associated with the fire-fighting exercises that occurred at Site 8. Mr. Ostrauskas clarified that the well samples were analyzed for full-scan Target Compound List (TCL) volatiles and that the illustrated compounds [trichloroethene (TCE), tetrachloroethene (PCE), and cis-1,2-dichloroethene (cis-1,2-DCE)] were selected as chemicals of concern based on their frequency of detection and concentration values. Al Wills, of the Bucks County Department of Health, asked why the maps only illustrated the results from Casey Village and along Kirk Road. Mr. Teamerson replied that there were a few other occurrences of positive detections but that they were isolated and did not form any consistent pattern.

Mr. Teamerson then updated the RAB on several other outstanding issues. Mr. Teamerson stated that the Navy community relations interviews are nearly complete and that the Community Relations Plan is being drafted. To date, seventeen residents and 19 public officials have been interviewed. Mr. Teamerson noted that, generally, the public officials feel that they have been kept fairly well informed on the various CERCLA activities at the base, but the residents have expressed concern that they have not been told the complete story. Mr. Teamerson then stated that the next round of off-base residential well sampling should take place in February and added that the sampling plan is currently being reviewed by EPA. Mr. Teamerson stated that the Navy has decided to sample all residential wells in the Flying Heels neighborhood.

Mr. Geyer, on behalf of the RAB, complimented the Navy on the amount of progress that has recently been made concerning this facility.

The next RAB meeting was scheduled for February 17, 1994.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

**ATTACHMENT I**

**ATTACHMENT I  
ATTENDANCE LIST**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NO.
Terri White	EPA	597-6925
Kevin Kilmartin	Halliburton NUS	(610) 971-0900
Jeff Orient	Halliburton NUS	(412) 921-8778
Neil Teamerson	Halliburton NUS	(610) 971-0900
Tom Ames	NAWCAD	(215) 441-1112
David Fennimore	Earth Data, Incorporated for WTMA	(215) 524-9466
Eugene B. McGough, Jr.	Township Manager, Warminster Township	(215) 443-5817
Joe Butch	Warminster Municipal Authority	(215) 675-3301
Al Wills	Bucks County Health Department	(215) 345-3325
Norm Kelly	Ivyland Borough	(215) 675-1157
George & Helen Hopely	Casey Village HomeOwners	(215) 357-7287
David Kennedy	PADER	(610) 832-6199
Ray Mannella	NORTHDIV	(215) 595-0566
Richard E. Lander	Northampton Municipal Authority	(215) 357-8515
John H. Geyer	Northampton Board of Supervisors	(215) 357-6800 (215) 357-5322
David C. Finch	Upper Southampton Township Assistant Manager	(215) 322-9700
Tim Pursel	Upper Southampton Municipal Authority	364-1390
Darius Ostrauskas	EPA	(215) 597-0549
Lonnie Monoco	NORTHDIV Remedial Project Manager	(610) 595-0567, ext. 164
James Duffy(?)	Public Spirit	675-3430
Ronald A. Sloto	U.S. Geological Survey	(215) 647-9008
Bob Lewandowski	NORTHDIV NAVFAC	(215) 595-0567, ext. 126
Phyllis Duffy	NORTHDIV NAVFAC	(215) 595-0567, ext. 188
D. S. Bianchi	PWO NAWCADIVWAR	(215) 441-3113
Frank Kurdziel	NAWC Environmental Office	(215) 441-7118
Joe Cody	NAWC Warminster BTC	(215) 441-3067
Lt. Jim Conroy	NORTHDIV NAVFAC	(610) 595-0567, ext. 117
Martin Dubin	Commander, Naval Base Philadelphia	(215) 897-8714
Steve Lehman	NORTHDIV	(215) 595-0567





# **RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**JANUARY 13, 1994**

## **MEETING AGENDA**

- \* WELCOME ABOARD**
- \* REVIEW OF MINUTES**
- \* CERFA REPORT**
- \* INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM UPDATE**
- \* BRAC CLEANUP PLAN**
- \* COMMUNITY REUSE UPDATE**
- \* MCKINNEY ACT UPDATE**